

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LUCIOUS WILSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

BUCATO, J. FLORES, C. and
HUCKLEBERRY,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-cv-00023-HBK

**ORDER SETTING SETTLEMENT
CONFERENCE AND PARAMETERS**

Settlement Statements due: April 11, 2024
Settlement Conference: April 18, 2024

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (*See* Doc. Nos. 1, 9, 21). Neither party opted out of the early settlement conference. (*See* Doc. No. 21). Therefore, this case is referred to Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean to conduct a settlement conference, which is scheduled to occur on **April 18, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.**

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. A settlement conference is scheduled to occur on **April 18, 2024 at 1:00 p.m.**, before Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean. The conference shall be conducted via Zoom videoconference and shall last up to three hours.

- 1 2. A representative with full and unlimited authority to negotiate and enter into a binding
2 settlement agreement shall attend.¹
- 3 3. Those in attendance must be prepared to discuss the claims, defenses, and damages at
4 issue in the case. The failure of any counsel, party, or authorized person subject to this
5 order to appear may result in the imposition of sanctions. In addition, the conference
6 will not proceed and will be reset to another date.
- 7 4. Defendants shall provide a confidential settlement statement no later than **April 11,**
8 **2024**, to the following email address: epgorders@caed.uscourts.gov. Plaintiff shall
9 mail his confidential settlement statement, clearly captioned “Confidential Settlement
10 Conference Statement,” Attn: Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean, United States
11 District Court, 2500 Tulare Street, Room 1501, Fresno, CA 93721 so that it arrives no
12 later than **July 11, 2022**. The Parties shall also file a Notice of Submission of
13 Confidential Settlement Conference Statement (see Local Rule 270(d)).
- 14 5. Settlement statements **should not be filed** with the Clerk of Court **nor served on any**
15 **other party**. Settlement statements shall be clearly marked “confidential” with the
16 date and time of the settlement conference indicated prominently thereon.
- 17 6. The confidential settlement statement shall be **no longer than five pages** in length,
18 typed or neatly printed, and include the following:
19 a. A brief statement of the facts of the case.
20 b. A brief statement of the claims and defenses, i.e., statutory or other grounds upon
21

22 ¹ While the exercise of its authority is subject to abuse of discretion review, “the district court has the authority to
23 order parties, including the federal government, to participate in mandatory settlement conferences...” United States
24 v. United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, 694 F.3d 1051, 1053, 1057, 1059 (9th Cir. 2012)
25 (“the district court has broad authority to compel participation in mandatory settlement conference[s].”). The term
26 “full authority to settle” means that the individuals attending the mediation conference must be authorized to fully
27 explore settlement options and to agree at that time to any settlement terms acceptable to the parties. G. Heileman
28 Brewing Co., Inc. v. Joseph Oat Corp., 871 F.2d 648, 653 (7th Cir. 1989), cited with approval in Official Airline
 Guides, Inc. v. Goss, 6 F.3d 1385, 1396 (9th Cir. 1993). The individual with full authority to settle must also have
 “unfettered discretion and authority” to change the settlement position of the party, if appropriate. Pitman v. Brinker
 Int’l, Inc., 216 F.R.D. 481, 485-86 (D. Ariz. 2003), amended on recon. in part, Pitman v. Brinker Int’l, Inc., 2003
 WL 23353478 (D. Ariz. 2003). The purpose behind requiring the attendance of a person with full settlement
 authority is that the parties’ view of the case may be altered during the face-to-face conference. Pitman, 216 F.R.D.
 at 486. An authorization to settle for a limited dollar amount or sum certain can be found not to comply with the
 requirement of full authority to settle. Nick v. Morgan’s Foods, Inc., 270 F.3d 590, 596-97 (8th Cir. 2001).

1 which the claims are founded; a forthright evaluation of the parties' likelihood of
2 prevailing on the claims and defenses; and a description of the major issues in
3 dispute.

4 c. An estimate of the cost and time to be expended for further discovery, pretrial, and
5 trial.

6 d. The party's position on settlement, including present demands and offers and a
7 history of past settlement discussions, offers, and demands.

8 e. A brief statement of the party's expectations and goals for the settlement
9 conference, including how much the party is willing to accept and/or willing to
10 pay.

11 f. If the parties intend to discuss the joint settlement of any other actions or claims
12 not in this suit, a brief description of each action or claim as set forth above,
13 including case number(s) if applicable.

14 7. The Clerk of Court is directed to serve a copy of this order on the Litigation Office at
15 **California Health Care Facility, Stockton, CA.**

16
17 Dated: March 18, 2024


HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18
19
20
21
22
23 Cc: Michelle Rooney, CRD
24
25
26
27
28